



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

the people would be better informed, and as a consequence more interested and more ready to oppose this enormous, not to say wicked, waste of the public revenues.

The friends of peace should make a positive effort to disseminate this information among the people.

Happily, pacific alliances, if I may use the word alliance in this way, are going forward with leaps and bounds. May God speed them. They are the omens of peace in the by-and-by. Within the last few months, Chile and the Argentine Republic, England and France, France and Italy, England and Italy, Holland and Denmark, have entered into such agreements; and if reports be correct, negotiations are well on the way for similar conventions between France and the four following nations: Belgium, Holland, Denmark, Norway and Sweden. The consequences of these pacific alliances will be in due time greater economy, less liability to attack, and stronger assurance. This sort of alliances tend directly to permanent peace, and when all nations shall have entered into them — that is, formed a world's pacific federation and put the Christian spirit into it — we shall be near the end of the struggle for universal and permanent peace.

There are, however, some steps between this and that. Some of these we notice briefly. There is, first, the economic view of the matter of a pacific alliance of the United States with England. Some statesmen, so called, seem to care little for the destruction and horrors of war, and so do not strive to avert it. On the other hand, they are deeply concerned in getting ready for it, and so indirectly incite to it. These statesmen ought to consider that an alliance of the kind here urged would tend to two great ends; first economy, and second, peace. Later on disarmament would also be the outcome.

Let us ally ourselves with England in an arbitration treaty, and we can then at once cease the consideration of navy bills appropriating a hundred millions, and especially such an insane bill as one proposing two and a half billions. Let us ally ourselves with England and stop all appropriations for increase of the navy. If we can't get higher in our aspirations for the sacred cause of peace, let us "stand pat" on the economic considerations. A few thousands would meet the expense of a pacific alliance with England, who is now ready for such a measure, while hundreds of millions would not prepare us to go into hostile contest with her. Peace and economy alike demand that we should enter into a pacific union with her. We have said that the sequence of a pacific alliance is disarmament. This is to be the end of the long series of movements and struggles in behalf of peace.

We are, it seems, soon to have an alliance with England, at least we ought to have. England has been ready for years to enter into such a bond. Our people, as a people, are also ready. You say, as the people rule, where is the trouble? The people rule through representatives. There is the trouble. If we fail, it will be because of the failure of our servants at Washington.

The alliance above named once consummated, it is safe to say that the two nations can at once announce to the world that they have resolved to cease to add to their armaments. This done, the twentieth century's greatest work is begun. The more surely so because France, already allied with England, will certainly follow,

and Italy allied with France will likewise follow. Thus we shall come to gradual disarmament. After that in due time will come the glorious consummation when "swords shall be beaten into ploughshares, and spears into pruning-hooks," when cannon shall be moulded into railroad iron, and navies be turned into merchant marine and mission ships, carrying to foreign lands the Gospel of Peace and the products of industry instead of swords and slaughter.

Women Would Stop War Altogether.

BY MARY ELIZABETH BLAKE.

From a symposium in the Boston Globe.

There is a strange anomaly in the mental, or perhaps I should say the moral, equipment of woman as a sex, which leads her often to be wanting in judgment upon small matters, while she is right-minded in her estimate of larger questions. This leads me to think that now, when a more rational understanding of the subject of war has been admitted into the counsels of men, women would go still one step farther on the way of progress, and put a stop to it altogether. For, in spite of her reputation, she is logical; and what does she find war doing in the settlement of difficulties?

In an age that has discarded the duel between individuals with righteous indignation, it proclaims unrebuked the greater duels of nations. In a century that maintains law and order as the poor man's hope and the rich man's safeguard, it shows the longest purse and strongest arm still gaining and holding the prize. With a religion that teaches justice and charity to all, and places brotherly love next to godliness, it sets the fiercest passions of hate aflame in the hearts of humanity, and where we spend gold and effort to make sure that not one blood-stained criminal shall die without having his uttermost right to life vindicated, it dooms hundreds of thousands to torture and slaughter.

Can women ignore these appalling incongruities? Can they close their eyes, no matter what the questions of state or pressure of circumstance, to a solution that does not solve, and a reckoning that only goes on increasing with time until another turn of fortune's wheel brings about another cataclysm of horror? Can she see the French child taught hatred of the German and the duty of revenge, even in his school songs, and imagine that the catastrophe of Sedan settled the question of territorial rights between the Gaul and the Teuton? Or believe that England's grip on the Transvaal is anything more than the clutch of the robber on the throat of his victim, or that it will hold if ever that victim becomes the stronger? Does war, in fact, ever settle the score of right and wrong, which is a moral argument — or only that of material advantage and stronger force, which is no settlement at all? And can woman, farther removed from turmoil of politics or fever of greed, or fierce struggle for power, help seeing this?

If women had their way, I am sure war would go, as a thousand and one wrongs of less happy ages have been doomed long since. It would disappear in its turn, as filth and plague and slavery and ignorance are disappearing. Its spirit would not be kept alive with loud clamors of false glory, with dazzle of uniform and flourish of martial music. The longing of the child for blare of trumpet

and drum, for waving banners and glittering parades, would not undermine the soul of the young man before his riper thought had learned the true meaning of the trade of the soldier.

I firmly believe that armies, shorn of their regalia, would languish for want of recruits; and I am sure women know it, if men do not. As for patriotism, that beautiful and fearless thing — how can a woman believe it is better taught in horror of blood and destruction than in the quiet of home, the prayer at the bedside, the wisdom of honorable lives? Fighting we must always have, thank God, while man is man; but look at the worlds waiting for warriors to conquer. What of the unselfish, unacclaimed heroes, who fight against disease and death, against fraud and oppression, perils by water and fire, by sin and suffering. There is no danger that the weapons of courage shall rust. And women, the mothers of men, know that these golden honors are won on loftier fields.

No! If it depended upon women, the barbarity of war would vanish with the barbarous centuries that recognized it.

War: Its Cause and Cure.

BY PRESIDENT THOMAS E. WILL.

Address before the First Annual Meeting of the Kansas Peace Society, Wichita, February 22, 1904.

Nearly two thousand years have passed since "Peace on earth, goodwill to men" was proclaimed; yet never were the armaments so vast or the war budgets so crushing, and the Christian nations are of all the most warlike. Why is this?

War is two-fold, industrial and military.

Military war is fought with bullets, bayonets and battleships. Industrial war is fought with strikes and lock-outs, with boycotts and injunctions, with stocks and bonds and rebates.

Homestead and Hazelton, Cripple Creek and Telluride illustrate labor war. The battles of giants over the Pennsylvania and Northern Pacific railways illustrate capitalistic war. Why the fight?

In industrial war the reason is plain. The bone of contention is money. Laborers want more wages; capitalists want more profits. Railroads and factories are fought for as a means of winning wealth.

Have you thought that military war has the same root cause as industrial war? What was the cause of the Boer War? Cecil Rhodes wanted the Cape-to-Cairo railroad and the opportunity to exploit Central Africa. He needed money. The money lay in South Africa in the gold fields and diamond mines. The Boers were in the way. The British government was invoked to push them aside. Hence the war.

Why the Cuban insurrection and the Spanish-American war? Seligman, in his "Economic Interpretation of History" (page 86), says: "It is no longer open to doubt that the Cuban insurrection, and thus indirectly the Spanish-American war, was the outcome of the sugar situation." From this came the Philippine War. Why? Senator Beveridge told us in his Senate speech, scattered broadcast under the caption "Under God." That which was "under God" was the almighty dollar.

There was money in the Philippines. "Duty and destiny" demanded that we seize them.

Then the Panama *coup*, which would mean war were not we so large and Colombia so small. The *New York World's* recent exposé, with names, dates, facts and figures, shows that back of that was a syndicate which had certain interests in the Panama railway and the French Canal Company and wished to unload them at an enormous profit. All the other steps in the subsequent proceedings were a part of the program of the syndicate.

Next, the far Eastern war. The "bone" is Korea. Russia seeks an outlet. Baffled at the Bosphorus and Afghanistan, she has sought the Pacific. Vladivostok is frozen much of the year. Korea would be an ideal outlet and base against China. Why does Russia want an outlet? That she may sell her goods.

But Japan is interested in Korea, too. She desires to work off there her surplus population and surplus goods; hence the clash.

But the surplus? Senator Depew explained it at the Philadelphia convention in 1900. He said: "What is the tendency of the future? Why this war in South Africa? Why this hammering at the gates in Pekin? Why this marching of troops from Asia to Africa? Why this parade of people from other empires and other lands? It is because the surplus production of civilized countries of modern times is greater than civilization can consume. It is because this over-production goes back to stagnation and to poverty. The American people produce two billion dollars' worth more than we can consume; and we have met the emergency and, by the providence of God, by the statesmanship of William McKinley, and by the valor of Roosevelt and his associates, we have our markets in Porto Rico, we have our market in Hawaii, we have our market in the Philippines, and we stand in the presence of eight hundred million people with the Pacific as an American lake."

Senator Hanna said in his speech in the Senate, December 13, 1900, "The production in the United States is one-third larger than our consumption."

Why have we surplus products? The census statistics of wealth distribution show that nine per cent. of the families of the United States own twenty-nine per cent. of the wealth, while fifty-two per cent. own only five per cent. We produce for buyers. The rich buy what they want, and stop. The poor buy what they can, and stop. Then production, profits and wages must stop unless other markets can be found. These we seek at the point of the bayonet and the muzzle of the gatling gun. Military war is a fight for the dollar.

The cure? Remove the cause. Transfer our industries from private to public ownership and control. Produce not for profit, but for use. What then? Labor wars will cease, for the workers will control their products. Capitalistic wars will cease for the same reason that feudal wars ceased in the early modern period. Feudal lords were deprived of their private armies. When the Rockefellers, Morgans, Goulds, Cassatts and Carnegies are deprived of the means of warfare, the industries and their armies of wage-earners and Pinkertons, they, too, will cease warring.

When we produce for use rather than for profit we